



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 544/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Mr John Doncon

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 1 ON DIAGRAM 36979 (KALGAN 6330)
Local Government Area: City Of Albany
Colloquial name: Tamaru Farm

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
1.5		Mechanical Removal	Cropping

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description	Clearing Description	Vegetation Condition	Comment
Beard Vegetation Associations 3- Medium forest; Jarrah marri (1.2ha) and 978 Low forest; Jarrah, Eucalyptus staeri and Allocasuarina fraseriana (0.3ha).	The vegetation proposed to be cleared comprises sparse trees (mostly marri) with no understorey. The trees are in poor condition due to a long history of grazing. There is no recruitment of young trees.	Completely Degraded: No longer intact; completely/almost completely without native species (Keighery 1994)	The vegetation is of limited value in the context of the farm or broader landscape. The landholder has retained other areas of native vegetation which are in good condition. The farm also has extensive planted corridors.

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

(a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle
The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has a low level of biological diversity.

Methodology Site visit

(b) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of, a significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle
The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has a low level of value for native fauna.

Methodology Site inspection

(c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, significant flora.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle
The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation has no understorey and the likelihood of significant flora being present is extremely low.

Methodology Site visit

(d) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of a significant ecological community.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The site is extremely degraded and has not been identified as part of the Threatened Ecological Community dataset.

Methodology GIS dataset: Threatened Ecological Communities CALM 15/7/2003 and site visit.

(e) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle as the vegetation is relatively well represented. While the vegetation association is not adequately reserved, the vegetation subject to this permit application is not a good candidate for reservation.

reserves/CALM-	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	% in managed land
IBRA Bioregion- Jarrah	4,544,335	2,665,480	58.7	Least concern	
Shire- City of Albany	383,843	149,341	38.9	Depleted	
Beard veg type-3	3,046,385	2,197,837	72.1	Least concern	10.1***
Beard veg type-978	66,468	26,010	39.1	Depleted	14.0***

* (Shepherd et al. 2001). ** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

*** The benchmark of 15% representation in conservation reserves (Janis, 1997) has not been met for this vegetation association.

Methodology Shepherd et al (2001) Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) Janis (1997)

(f) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the vegetation is not associated with any wetlands or watercourses.

Methodology Site visit

(g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the vegetation has limited hydrological function due to its poor condition and small area. The removal of this vegetation is unlikely to contribute to land degradation risk.

Methodology Site visit

(h) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the vegetation is not associated with conservation land and does not contribute to connectivity in any significant way.

Methodology Site visit

(i) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the area is small and the vegetation is in poor condition. The vegetation removal will not significantly contribute to degradation of water quality.

Methodology Site visit

(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence of flooding.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The proposal is not at variance with this Principle as the area is not prone to flooding.

Methodology Site visit

Planning instrument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.

Comments

The proposal is not at variance with any known planning instrument or decision.

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Cropping	Mechanical Removal	1.5	Grant	It is recommended that the clearing permit be granted as the proposal is not at variance with any of the Clearing Principles.

5. References

- Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) Biodiversity Action Planning. Action planning for native biodiversity at multiple scales ; catchment bioregional, landscape, local. Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Victoria.
- JANIS Forests Criteria (1997) Nationally agreed criteria for the establishment of a comprehensive, Adequate and Representative reserve System for Forests in Australia. A report by the Joint ANZECC/MCFFA National Forest Policy Statement Implementation Sub-committee. Regional Forests Agreement process. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- Keighery, BJ (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R. and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001) Native Vegetation in Western Australia, Extent, Type and Status. Resource Management Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.